

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Wissam Hammoud,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 14-14398

United States Attorney, *et al.*,

Sean F. Cox

United States District Court Judge

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**  
**ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING**  
**APRIL 30, 2015 REPORT & RECOMMENDATION**

Acting *pro se*, Plaintiff filed this action asserting claims against the United States Attorney, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the Transportation Security Administration.

This Court referred all pretrial matters in this action to Magistrate Judge Patricia Morris. (See Docket Entry No. 11).

On April 30, 2015, Magistrate Judge Morris issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket Entry No. 31) wherein she recommends that: 1) Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Docket Entry No. 20) be granted; and 2) Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket Entry No. 9), Motion for Reconsideration on Oral Argument (Docket Entry No. 18), and for Clarification on Appointment of Counsel (Docket Entry No. 19) be denied as moot. She also recommends that Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (Docket Entry No. 30) be denied.

Magistrate Judge Morris's Report and Recommendation expressly advised Plaintiff that

he must file any objections to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen days and that “[a]ny objections must be labeled as ‘Objection No. 1,’ ‘Objection No. 2,’ etc.” and that “Any objection must recite precisely the provision of this Report and Recommendation to which it pertains.” (Report and Recommendation at 13).

Pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), a party objecting to the recommended disposition of a matter by a Magistrate Judge must file objections to the R&R within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of the R&R. “The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a *de novo* determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the magistrate judge’s disposition to which specific written objection has been made.” *Id.*

No party has filed objections<sup>1</sup> to the R&R and the time permitted for filing objections to the R&R has long since passed.

The Court hereby ADOPTS the April 30, 2015 Report and Recommendation. IT IS ORDERED that: 1) Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket Entry No. 9), Motion for Reconsideration on Oral Argument (Docket Entry No. 18), and for Clarification on Appointment of Counsel (Docket Entry No. 19) ARE DENIED; 2) Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Docket Entry No. 20) is GRANTED; and 3) this action shall be DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motions filed as Docket Entry Nos. 33, 39

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff has submitted a number of filings unrelated to the Report and Recommendation, such as letters to the Court (*see, e.g.*, Docket Entry Nos. 35 and 41) and additional motions asking the Court for preliminary injunctive relief (*see, e.g.*, 33, 39 & 44). Given that Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation and the Court is dismissing this action, Plaintiff cannot establish a likelihood of success on the merits of his claims and the Court shall deny these additional motions as moot.

and 44 are DENIED AS MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 12, 2015

S/ Sean F. Cox

Sean F. Cox

U. S. District Judge

I hereby certify that on August 12, 2015, the foregoing document was served on counsel of record via electronic means and upon Wissam Hammoud via First Class mail at the address below:

Wissam T. Hammoud 39876-018  
Federal Correctional Center  
Terminal Island  
P.O. Box 3007  
San Pedro, CA 90731

S/ J. McCoy

Case Manager